DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 613 CE 007 904

AUTHOR Grover, Robert H.; McCormick, Robert W.
TITLE Factors Influencing Family Migration from Appalachia. Summary of Research Series.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Dept. of Agricultural Education.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demography; Economic Research; *Family Mobility; *Farmers; Individual Characteristics; Migration; Migration Patterns; Mobility; Motivation; Relocation; Rural Family; *Rural to Urban Migration; Social Values; *Socioeconomic Influences; *Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS Appalachia; *Ohio

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to compare farm brothers who stayed in the rural areas of Ohio with urban brothers who migrated to large metropolitan areas of Ohio. The objectives were (1) to identify and compare selected characteristics of farm owners or operators who stayed on a farm in the Appalachian region of Ohio with selected characteristics of their brothers who moved to a metropolitan area (age, age of family members, family size, education, occupation and employment, sibling order, residence and mobility, involvement in social institutions, marital status, satisfaction with life, income, social class, aspirations for employment and business opportunities, and future residence plans), (2) to determine the extent of inter-generational and intra-generational interaction for both groups, (3) to compare rural and urban brothers with respect to attitudes toward selected American societal values, and (4) to identify factors that weighed heavily on the decision to stay in the Appalachian region of Ohio or migrate to a metropolitan area. Farmers in the 28 counties in the Southern and Eastern Appalachian region of Ohio served as the basic population. The counties were stratified into three groups based upon total population, and three counties were randomly selected from the high, three from the medium, and two from low population groups. After further random sampling 44 rural farmers were interviewed as were their 44 urban brothers. Findings, conclusions, recommendations, and references are included. (WL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128613

SEP 7 1976

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

FACTORS INFLUENCING FAMILY MIGRATION FROM APPALACHIA

Robert H. Groves and Robert W. McCormick

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTRODUCTION

THE MIGRATION OF PEOPLE HAS BEEN STUDIED FOR MANY CENTURIES. KLINE (1898, P. 5) DESCRIBED MIGRATION AS " AN ACTIVITY OF THE SOUL, WOVEN INTO LEGENDS AND FOLKLORE, DISCUSSED IN HISTORY AND SCIENCE, AND AFFECTING PROFOUNDLY THE DOMESTIC AND SOCIAL LIFE OF A PEOPLE." DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY THE APPALACHIAN REGION OF OUR COUNTRY ENJOYED FINE PROSPERITY WITH COAL MINING AND INDUSTRIES RELATED TO IT IN FULL FLOURISH. BUT, IN THE EARLY 1900'S ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE AREA BEGAN TO CHANGE AND SINCE THAT TIME WE HAVE SEEN EXTREME AMOUNTS OF MIGRATION FROM THE APPALACHIAN AREA.

IN THE DECADE FROM 1960 TO 1970 MOST OF THE COUNTIES IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION OF OHIO DECREASED IN POPULATION BY FROM ONE TO FIVE PERCENT. IN FACT, 75% OF OHIO'S RURAL COUNTIES EXPERIENCED A NET OUT-MIGRATION DURING THE 1960 TO 1970 PERIOD. ONLY ATHENS, CLERMONT, AND WASHINGTON COUNTIES EXPERIENCED IN-MIGRATION ACCORDING TO MITCHELL AND THOMAS (1972, P. 1).

FACTORS INFLUENCING FAMILY MIGRATION FROM APPALACHIA

CE 007 904

UNDERSTANDING NET MIGRATION GIVES SOME MEASURE OF THE STRENGTH OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESOURCES OF AN AREA. LOSSES OF POPULATION THROUGH MIGRATION OFTEN INDICATE THAT THERE ARE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL CONDITIONS THAT ARE LESS ATTRACTIVE THAN IN OTHER AREAS. THOSE WHO MOVE AWAY ARE USUALLY YOUNG ADULTS. THE HOME COMMUNITY HAS A MAJOR INVESTMENT IN THESE YOUNG PEOPLE THROUGH THE EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES AND OTHER SERVICES OFFERED DURING THE DEVELOPING YEARS. COUNTIES THAT RECEIVE THESE MIGRANTS FIND MOST OF THESE YOUNG PEOPLE ARE IN THEIR PRODUCTIVE YEARS READY TO WORK. THEY CONTRIBUTE TO THE SUPPORT OF THE RECEIVING COUNTY AND IT'S CITIES.

NATIONALLY THERE HAS BEEN A GREAT DEAL OF EMPHASIS ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT WITH THE PASSAGE OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1972 AND SIMILAR LEGISLATION. AREA NEWSPAPERS HAVE RELATED THE PURPOSES OF THIS RURAL DEVELOPMENT EMPHASIS AS " TO HELP CREATE ECONOMIC GROWTH IN RURAL AREAS" AND " TO HALT MIGRATION FROM THE COUNTRYSIDE TO THE BIG CITIES." (ZANESVILLE TIMES RECORDER, FEBRUARY 1, 1972, P. 1). IN FACT, RECENT FIGURES WOULD SEEM TO INDICATE THAT THERE IS A SLOWING IN THE MIGRATION FROM RURAL TO URBAN AREAS AND A GROWING IN-MIGRATION TO THE APPALACHIAN REGION OF OHIO.

ANOTHER SOCIO-CULTURAL INFLUENCE OF MIGRATION IS THE FAMILY. FAMILIES IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION SEEM TO VALUE FAMILY AND KIN FAR MORE THAN ANY OTHER SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS. ACCORDING TO RICO-VELASCO (1969, P. 26) THEY TEND TO FORM " CLOSE-KNIT" ORGANIZATIONS THAT RESEMBLE A SOCIAL GROUP WITH A DENSE TEXTURE OF RELATIONSHIPS.

THE EXTENDED FAMILY ORGANIZATION IS NOT ONLY MAINTAINED AND ENCOURAGED AMONG THE MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY WHO ARE LIVING NEARBY, BUT THE RELATIONSHIP GOES BEYOND THE IMMEDIATE AREA, WHERE NEARLY EVERYONE IS RELATED IN SOME WAY TO THE OTHERS, TO RELATIVES SOMETIMES LIVING AT GREAT DISTANCES IN OTHER RURAL COMMUNITIES, SMALL TOWNS OR IN BIG CITIES. MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY LIVING IN OTHER PLACES OFTEN PLAN TRIPS TO VISIT RELATIVES IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION. THIS TYPE OF REGULAR CONTACT KEEPS PERMANENT KIN RELATIONSHIPS NO MATTER WHAT THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTANCE.

ALTHOUGH THERE HAS BEEN MUCH RESEARCH ON FAMILY MIGRATION RELATIVELY LITTLE HAS BEEN DONE IN TERMS OF SIBLING MIGRATION. SEVERAL QUESTIONS COULD BE POSED IN THIS REGARD.

1. WHY DO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF A FAMILY STAY IN THE AREA WHERE THEY ARE BORN AND REARED WHILE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE SAME FAMILY MIGRATE TO URBAN CENTERS?

2. Are there kin ties that keep certain children of the family at home? For example, does the first child tend to stay in the home community? Does sex of the first child make a difference in who stays and who moves away?

3. What are the forces within the family that are predominant in the migration pattern?

4. How do personal characteristics such as education and age of the rural residents compare with siblings who move to urban areas?

5. What reasons do families have for remaining in their home areas or migrating?

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

American society, at this stage of development, seems to be expressing a desire to slow, even halt, the migration from rural to urban areas. Proposals of the Congress point toward development of rural areas to a degree that would promote out-migration from city to country. The pressures and problems of urbanization have undoubtedly speeded the development of this concept.

If it is desirable and possible to reverse the historical migration trend then additional research seemed desirable. Such research could help various organizations to better understand migration forces. A comparison of farm families who stayed in the rural areas with siblings who moved into metropolitan areas would be beneficial. Such research would provide a better understanding of some of the economic factors and social forces that might encourage people to return to their community of birth. It would also be useful in policy decisions affecting migration patterns.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to compare farm brothers who stayed in the rural areas of Ohio with urban brothers who migrated to large metropolitan areas of Ohio. In the study selected

4.

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GROUP OF RURAL BROTHERS WERE COMPARED WITH URBAN BROTHERS; THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD SELECTED AMERICAN SOCIETAL VALUES WERE COMPARED; INTER-GENERATIONAL AND INTRA-GENERATIONAL INTERACTION WITH PARENTS AND SIBLINGS WERE COMPARED AND INFORMATION WAS GAINED CONCERNING THE REASONS FOR STAYING IN THE RURAL AREA OR MIGRATING TO THE URBAN AREA.

OBJECTIVES

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY WERE:

1. TO IDENTIFY AND COMPARE SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF FARM OWNERS OR OPERATORS WHO STAYED ON A FARM IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION OF OHIO WITH SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR BROTHERS WHO MOVED TO A METROPOLITAN AREA. THESE CHARACTERISTICS INCLUDED:

    A. AGE
    B. AGES OF FAMILY MEMBERS
    C. FAMILY SIZE
    D. EDUCATION
    E. OCCUPATION AND EMPLOYMENT
    F. SIBLING ORDER
    G. RESIDENCES AND MOBILITY
    H. INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS
    I. MARITAL STABILITY
    J. SATISFACTION WITH LIFE
    K. INCOME
    L. SOCIAL CLASS
    M. ASPIRATIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT AND BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES
    N. FUTURE RESIDENCE PLANS

2. TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF INTER-GENERATIONAL AND INTRA-GENERATIONAL INTERACTION FOR BOTH GROUPS OF BROTHERS.

3. TO COMPARE RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WITH RESPECT TO THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD SELECTED AMERICAN SOCIETAL VALUES.

4. TO IDENTIFY FACTORS THAT WEIGHED HEAVILY ON THE DECISION TO STAY IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION OF OHIO OR MIGRATE TO A METROPOLITAN AREA.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Farmers in the 28 counties in the southern and eastern Appalachian region of Ohio served as the basic population. The counties were stratified into three groups based upon total population. Three counties were randomly selected from the high population group, three from the medium population group and two from the low population group. Sample counties were Scioto, Ross, Washington, Guernsey, Gallia, Carroll, Pike and Morgan.

Lists of farmers were secured from the Ohio Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for each of the eight counties. These were randomly sampled so that the number of farmers' names drawn from each county was in relative proportion to the number of farmers in a township. After the names were randomly drawn for the county they were again randomized for order of contact.

In order to be included in the sample a farmer must have had a brother in Ohio, in a metropolitan area, in or adjacent to a city of 100,000 or more. The urban brother must have migrated to the urban area.

Initial contacts were made by the principal investigator by telephone to determine eligibility of rural brothers and urban brothers. Interviewers were hired and trained by the principal investigator, then visited the respondents in their homes to administer the interview schedule. All interviews were conducted between May and October 1974.

A total of 44 rural brothers and 44 urban brothers comprised the sample for the research project.

An interview schedule was developed by the research investigator and a committee of Ohio State University professors in Continuing Education, Family and Child Development, Agricultural Education, and Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology. The final interview schedule consisted of 50 questions in two parts. The first 44 questions related to personal characteristics, migration, family interaction, attitudes towards societal values, organizational involvement, and satisfaction as expressed by the respondents. The final six questions were completed by the interviewer to provide data in arriving at social status scores for respondents. The interview schedules administered were parallel in that most questions were identical for rural and urban brothers

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE RELATING TO FARM ACREAGE AND ENTERPRISES AND REASONS FOR STAYING OR LEAVING THE " HOME" AREA.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES WERE RETURNED TO THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR UPON COMPLETION OF THE INTERVIEW. SCHEDULES WERE CODED AND THE DATA TRANSFERRED TO TALLY SHEETS. DATA WERE HAND TABULATED TO GAIN FREQUENCIES, PERCENTAGES, AND MEANS. IN STATISTICAL CALCULATIONS INVOLVING RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS, SPEARMAN'S RHO WAS USED AS THE STATISTICAL TEST. CHI-SQUARE TESTS WERE USED TO DETERMINE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS. WEIGHTED SCORES WERE USED IN DETERMINING SOCIAL CLASS OF RESPONDENTS. WHERE STATISTICAL TESTS WERE APPLIED A LEVEL OF .05 OR LESS WAS CONSIDERED SIGNIFICANT.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

AGE

THE MEAN AGE OF RURAL BROTHERS WAS 48.8 YEARS AND FOR URBAN BROTHERS 48.2 YEARS. THIS DIFFERENCE WAS NOT SIGNIFICANT.

THE MEAN AGE OF SPOUSES OF RURAL BROTHERS WAS 46.1 YEARS AND FOR SPOUSES OF URBAN BROTHERS 44.41 YEARS. THE AGE OF SPOUSES COMPARED TO THE AGE OF RESPONDENTS WAS NOT SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT FOR THE TWO GROUPS.

WHEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WERE COMPARED ON THE BASIS OF FAMILY LIFE STAGE, NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND.

FAMILY SIZE

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS REGARDING FAMILY SIZE OR NUMBER OF PERSONS IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF RESPONDENTS. MORE THAN TWICE AS MANY RURAL BROTHERS AS URBAN BROTHERS HAD FAMILY SIZES OF SEVEN OR MORE. THE EXTENDED FAMILY LIVING IN ONE HOUSEHOLD SEEMS TO BE PRACTICALLY NON-EXISTENT IN BOTH RURAL AND URBAN AREAS. ONLY TWO RURAL BROTHERS AND ONE URBAN BROTHER HAD OTHER THAN IMMEDIATE FAMILY (PARENTS OR GRANDCHILDREN) LIVING WITH THEM. NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WAS FOUND WHEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WERE COMPARED ON THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN WHO MOVED FROM THE HOME.

Education

Rural brothers had completed a mean of 10.86 years of formal education compared to 12.14 years for urban brothers. Three times as many urban brothers as rural brothers had 16 or more years of education.

Although some differences were observed when education of respondents was compared to other siblings, they were not significant. Between 40 to 45 percent of the respondents had the same amount of education as other siblings which indicated uniformity of emphasis on education in a family group.

No significant difference was found between rural and urban brothers when high school completion status was compared by age group. A higher percentage of younger urban migrants had not completed high school than was true of rural brothers.

No significant difference was found in post high school educational training of rural and urban brothers. Fifty-five percent of rural brothers and 68 percent of urban brothers had received some past high school education. Job-related vocational or technical education was the most frequent type of post high school education for both groups.

There was no significant difference between rural and urban brothers when timing of the migration decision was related to post high school education. Seventy-nine percent of rural brothers and 87 percent of urban brothers had made the decision to migrate or not to migrate prior to post high school education.

Occupation

A significant difference was found in occupation of rural and urban brothers. Nearly twice as many urban brothers were in professional, technical, and managerial positions as were the rural brothers. Three times as many craftsmen and foremen were evident among urban brothers as compared to rural brothers. It should be remembered that the 18 full time farmers were not considered in making comparisons of major occupations because the nature of the study did not permit urban brothers to be farmers.

It was found that 41 percent of the rural respondents were full time farmers. Fifty percent of the rural respondents worked full time off the farm. Forty-five percent of the rural brothers farmed from 50 to 200 acres. Sixteen percent farmed 500 acres or more. Hay, beef, corn, wheat, and swine were the primary farming enterprises reported by rural brothers.

FIFTEEN URBAN BROTHERS OWNED SOME LAND THAT THEY USED FOR RECREATION, INVESTMENT OR BUSINESS SUCH AS TRUCK FARMING OR GENERAL FARMING. ONLY TWO URBAN BROTHERS OWNED MORE THAN 100 ACRES.

SIBLING ORDER

THERE WAS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WHEN THEY WERE COMPARED ON THE BASIS OF THEIR POSITION IN THE BIRTH ORDER OF THEIR FAMILIES.

RESIDENCES AND MOBILITY

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND WHEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WERE COMPARED ON RESIDENCE HISTORY AND MOBILITY. URBAN BROTHERS HAD A SIGNIFICANTLY LARGER NUMBER OF RESIDENCES SINCE BIRTH AND HAD LIVED A SMALLER MEAN LENGTH OF TIME AT EACH RESIDENCE. URBAN BROTHERS HAD ALSO LIVED A SHORTER LENGTH OF TIME AT THEIR PRESENT LOCATION. ALL VALUES WERE SIGNIFICANT AT THE .01 LEVEL. ALMOST 80 PERCENT OF THE RURAL BROTHERS HAD LIVED AT LEAST 20 YEARS AT THEIR PRESENT LOCATION COMPARED TO 36 PERCENT FOR URBAN BROTHERS.

INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

THERE WAS LITTLE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WHEN COMPARED ON OVERALL INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS. THE MEAN WEIGHTED SCORE OF PARTICIPATION FOR RURAL BROTHERS WAS 9.18 COMPARED TO 8.87 FOR URBAN BROTHERS. THERE WAS SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN SPECIFIC GROUPS SUCH AS FARM ORGANIZATION (RURAL BROTHERS MORE ACTIVE) AND VETERANS, RECREATIONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL GROUPS (URBAN BROTHERS MORE ACTIVE).

MARITAL STABILITY

MARITAL STATUS OF RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS SHOWED NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE. THERE WERE NO DIVORCES AMONG THE 43 RURAL RESPONDENTS WHO HAD BEEN MARRIED. THIRTY-SEVEN URBAN BROTHERS WERE MARRIED ONLY ONCE, FIVE WERE MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE, ONE WAS DIVORCED AND ONE WAS SINGLE.

SATISFACTION WITH LIFE

RURAL BROTHERS INDICATED A SLIGHTLY HIGHER SATISFACTION WITH LIFE THAN DID URBAN BROTHERS. THIS WAS ESPECIALLY TRUE AT THE TIME OF THE DECISION TO STAY OR LEAVE THE " HOME" COMMUNITY. RURAL BROTHERS 50 YEARS OR OLDER INDICATED A VERY HIGH SCORE (9.33) AT THE TIME OF DECISION TO STAY IN THE " HOME" COMMUNITY. BOTH GROUPS OF BROTHERS INDICATE MUCH OPTIMISM FOR

THE FUTURE WITH MEAN WEIGHTED SCORES OF 9.00 FOR URBAN BROTHERS AND 9.55 FOR RURAL BROTHERS ON A 10 POINT SCALE.

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND WHEN THE RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTION OF HIS INTERVIEWED BROTHER'S SATISFACTION WITH LIFE WAS COMPARED WITH HIS OWN. THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE AT THE .01 LEVEL WHEN THE RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTION OF ALL SIBLINGS SATISFACTION WITH LIFE WAS COMPARED WITH HIS OWN. MORE RURAL BROTHERS THAN URBAN BROTHERS PERCEIVED THEIR OWN SATISFACTION AS THE " SAME" OR " BETTER" THAN THEIR BROTHERS AND SISTERS.

DIFFERENCES IN ANNUAL INCOME LEVELS OF RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WAS SIGNIFICANT AT THE .01 LEVEL. TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF URBAN BROTHERS COMPARED TO FIVE PERCENT OF RURAL BROTHERS HAD INCOME OVER $20,000.

WHEN THE RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTION OF THE INTERVIEWED BROTHER'S FINANCIAL SITUATION WAS COMPARED WITH HIS OWN, NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND. BUT WHEN THE RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTION OF ALL SIBLINGS' FINANCIAL SITUATION WAS COMPARED WITH HIS OWN, A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE AT THE .01 LEVEL WAS FOUND. MORE RURAL BROTHERS THAN URBAN BROTHERS PERCEIVED THEIR OWN FINANCIAL SITUATION AS BEING THE " SAME" OR " BETTER" THAN THEIR BROTHERS AND SISTERS.

Social Class

WARNER'S " INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS" (1960, PP. 121-185) WAS USED IN ARRIVING AT A SOCIAL CLASS FOR EACH OF THE RESPONDENTS. NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WAS FOUND ON QUALITY OF HOMES OR THE COMPOSITE SOCIAL STATUS SCORES. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND IN THE QUALITY OF DWELLING AREA (.01 LEVEL) AND MAJOR SOURCE OF INCOME (.05 LEVEL) BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS.

ALMOST 80 PERCENT OF RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS PERCEIVED THAT THEIR FAMILY WAS RESPECTED ABOUT THE SAME AS OTHERS IN THEIR COMMUNITY.

Aspirations

ASPIRATIONS OF RURAL BROTHERS APPEARED TO BE FULFILLED ABOUT AS THEY HAD PLANNED AT THE DECISION TO STAY IN THE RURAL AREA. FORTY-ONE PERCENT WERE FARMING FULL TIME AS PLANNED, 45 PERCENT HAD PLANNED TO FARM AND WORK OFF THE FARM. ACTUAL COUNTS INDICATED THAT 59 PERCENT WERE NOW FARMING AND WORKING OFF THE FARM. URBAN BROTHERS INDICATED A LACK OF JOB OPPORTUNITIES IN THEIR HOME RURAL AREA AT THE

TIME OF DECISION TO MIGRATE. THIRTY-FOUR PERCENT HAD PLANNED TO WORK AT THE PRESENT OCCUPATION AT WHICH THEY WERE CURRENTLY ENGAGED.

FIFTY-SEVEN PERCENT OF THE RURAL BROTHERS PLAN TO MAINTAIN THEIR FARMING OCCUPATION ABOUT AS IT IS NOW WHILE 30 PERCENT INDICATE THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF THEIR FARMING OPERATION. SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF URBAN BROTHERS INDICATE THAT THEY PLAN TO REMAIN AT THEIR CURRENT JOB AND 23 PERCENT PLAN TO RETIRE WITHIN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.

FUTURE RESIDENCE PLANS

A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND WHEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS WERE COMPARED ON FUTURE RESIDENCE PLANS. MORE THAN 36 PERCENT OF THE URBAN BROTHERS INDICATED THAT THEY PLAN TO STAY LESS THAN TEN YEARS IN THEIR PRESENT COMMUNITY. CONVERSELY, MORE THAN 90 PERCENT OF RURAL BROTHERS PLAN TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT COMMUNITY INDEFINITELY. THESE FINDINGS WERE SIGNIFICANT AT THE .01 LEVEL. MORE THAN 37 PERCENT OF THE URBAN BROTHERS INDICATED THAT THEY PLAN TO RETIRE IN THE RURAL " HOME" AREA. SOME 45 PERCENT PLANNED TO MAINTAIN THE URBAN WAY OF LIFE.

NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE WAS FOUND BETWEEN RESPONDENTS WHO CONSIDERED LEAVING OR RETURNING TO THEIR HOME AREA SINCE THE DECISION TO STAY IN THE RURAL AREA OR MIGRATE.

INTER-GENERATIONAL AND INTRA-GENERATIONAL INTERACTION

THERE WAS A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS IN THE FREQUENCY OF VISITS IN THE PAST YEAR WITH THEIR PARENTS. EIGHTY-FIVE PERCENT OF THE RURAL BROTHERS HAD VISITED THEIR PARENTS ONCE A MONTH OR OFTENER COMPARED TO 63 PERCENT OF THE URBAN BROTHERS. SIXTY-TWO PERCENT OF RURAL BROTHERS COMPARED TO SEVEN PERCENT OF URBAN BROTHERS HAD VISITED THEIR PARENTS AS FREQUENTLY AS ONCE A WEEK. TWENTY-THREE PARENTS OF RURAL BROTHERS COMPARED TO ONLY ONE PARENT OF URBAN BROTHERS LIVED WITHIN A DISTANCE OF 20 MILES OR LESS.

THERE WAS NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS ON MOST FREQUENT VISIT WITH ANY SIBLING DURING THE PAST YEAR. MORE RURAL BROTHERS THAN URBAN BROTHERS VISITED A SIBLING " ONCE A DAY OR OFTENER." THE MOST FREQUENT INTER-ACTION WITH A SIBLING WAS MONTHLY OR QUARTERLY FOR BOTH RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS.

CONTACT SCORES WERE USED AS A METHOD TO COMBINE FREQUENCY OF VISITATION AND DISTANCE DIMENSIONS OF INTERACTION. AS A RESULT OF GREATER DISTANCES, CONTACT SCORES WERE HIGHER FOR URBAN BROTHERS WITH PARENT, URBAN BROTHERS WITH RURAL RESPONDENT

BROTHER, AND URBAN BROTHERS WITH ALL SIBLINGS. FURTHER ANALYSIS OF CONTACT SCORES WERE MADE BY COMPARING THOSE ABOVE THE MEAN AND THOSE NOT ABOVE THE MEAN. NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND USING THIS ANALYSIS FOR ANY OF THE THREE INTERACTION PATTERNS.

Attitudes Toward Selected Values

THERE WAS A HIGH DEGREE OF CORRELATION ($R_S = .85$ $_P < .01$) BETWEEN RANKINGS OF RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS ATTITUDES TOWARD TEN SELECTED AMERICAN SOCIETAL VALUES. THE VALUE THAT RANKED HIGHEST WITH BOTH GROUPS WAS " FAMILY SECURITY" WHILE " SOCIAL RECOGNITION" RANKED AT THE BOTTOM FOR BOTH GROUPS. THE VALUE " SALVATION" WAS RANKED CONSIDERABLY HIGHER BY RURAL BROTHERS THAN BY URBAN BROTHERS WHILE " MATURE LOVE" WAS RANKED HIGHER BY URBAN BROTHERS THAN BY RURAL BROTHERS.

Factors Influencing Migration Decision

FORTY-EIGHT PERCENT OF THE RURAL BROTHERS INDICATED THAT THE MAIN REASON THEY STAYED IN THE RURAL AREA WAS BECAUSE THEY " LIKED THE COMMUNITY" WHILE 18 PERCENT INDICATED THE " OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE OVER THE FARM" AS THE MAJOR REASON. FORTY-THREE PERCENT OF URBAN BROTHERS LISTED " LITTLE OPPORTUNITY FOR EMPLOYMENT" AND 32 PERCENT " FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITIES WERE LACKING" AS THE MAJOR REASON FOR LEAVING THE RURAL AREA. NINE PERCENT OF THE URBAN BROTHERS INDICATED " TO GO TO COLLEGE" AS THE MAJOR REASON FOR MIGRATING.

EIGHTY-FOUR PERCENT OF THE RURAL RESPONDENTS AND 91 PERCENT OF THE URBAN BROTHERS INDICATED THAT THEIR OWN PERSONAL CHOICE HAD THE GREATEST INFLUENCE ON THEIR DECISION TO STAY OR LEAVE THE HOME AREA. WIVES, PARENTS, AND OTHERS HAD RELATIVELY LITTLE INFLUENCE ON THE MIGRATION DECISION.

CONCLUSIONS

THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSIONS WERE BASED ON THE INTERPRETATIONS OF THIS STUDY.

1. RURAL BROTHERS STAYED IN THE HOME AREA BECAUSE THEY " LIKED THE COMMUNITY" OR HAD AN " OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE OVER A FARM."

2. URBAN BROTHERS MIGRATED FROM THE RURAL AREA BECAUSE OF " LITTLE OPPORTUNITY FOR EMPLOYMENT" OR " FINANCIAL OPPORTUNITIES WERE LACKING."

3. THERE WAS A HIGH POSITIVE CORRELATION BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS IN THEIR RANKINGS OF TEN AMERICAN SOCIETAL VALUES. BOTH GROUPS RATED " FAMILY SECURITY" AS THE MOST IMPORTANT. THERE WAS SUBSTANTIAL DISAGREEMENT ON ONLY TWO OF THE TEN VALUES.

4. THE DECISION TO STAY IN THE RURAL AREA OR MIGRATE WAS PRIMARILY A PERSONAL DECISION ON THE PART OF THE RESPONDENT.

5. RURAL BROTHERS SHOWED A HIGHER FREQUENCY OF VISITS IN THE PAST YEAR WITH PARENTS THAN DID URBAN BROTHERS. THERE WAS LITTLE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS ON THE MOST FREQUENT VISIT WITH ANY SIBLING DURING THE PAST YEAR.

6. RURAL BROTHERS AND URBAN BROTHERS DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY IN PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS SUCH AS MAJOR OCCUPATION, NUMBER OF RESIDENCES SINCE BIRTH, MEAN LENGTH OF TIME AT EACH RESIDENCE, LENGTH OF TIME AT PRESENT LOCATION, INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS WHEN CONSIDERING SPECIFIC GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS, PERCEIVED SATISFACTION WITH LIFE WHEN COMPARED TO ALL SIBLINGS, ANNUAL INCOME, QUALITY OF DWELLING AREA IN WHICH THEY LIVED, MAJOR SOURCE OF INCOME AND LENGTH OF TIME THEY EXPECT TO REMAIN IN THEIR PRESENT COMMUNITY.

7. THERE WAS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN BROTHERS IN PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS SUCH AS AGE, AGE OF SPOUSES, FAMILY LIFE STAGE, FAMILY SIZE, NUMBER OF PERSONS IN THEIR HOUSEHOLD, NUMBER OF CHILDREN NO LONGER LIVING AT HOME, EDUCATION, EDUCATION COMPARED TO THAT OF OTHER SIBLINGS, HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION, POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION, TIMING OF MIGRATION DECISION RELATIVE TO POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION, SIBLING ORDER, OVERALL INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS, MARITAL STATUS, FINANCIAL SITUATION AS COMPARED TO THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE OTHER INTERVIEWED BROTHER, QUALITY OF HOMES, SOCIAL STATUS, PERCEIVED RESPECT IN THE COMMUNITY, AND CONSIDERATION OF LEAVING OR RETURNING TO HOME AREA.

8. CONTACT SCORES TO MEASURE FREQUENCY OF VISITATION AND DISTANCE WERE HIGHER FOR URBAN BROTHERS THAN RURAL CONCERNING VISITATION OF PARENTS, SIBLINGS AND THE OTHER RESPONDENT BROTHER. HOWEVER, THERE WAS NO DIFFERENCE WHEN THESE CONTACT SCORES WERE COMPARED BY FREQUENCIES ABOVE AND BELOW THE MEAN.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS WERE BASED UPON THE DATA OBTAINED IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT AND THE LITERATURE REVIEWED. THEY WERE TEMPERED BY THE EXPERIENCE AND JUDGMENT OF THE WRITER.

1. ASSUMING THAT A RURAL COMMUNITY WISHES TO REDUCE THE OUTMIGRATION OF MALES IT SHOULD PLACE PRIMARY EMPHASIS ON PROVIDING GOOD FINANCIAL AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEM.

2. IF IT IS DESIRED TO ENCOURAGE RURAL MALES TO STAY IN THEIR HOME COMMUNITIES APPEAL SHOULD BE MADE TO THEIR PERSONAL DESIRES RATHER THAN TO FAMILY OR FRIENDS.

3. SINCE THE DECISION TO MIGRATE SEEMS TO BE MADE PRIOR TO POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION, SCHOOL GUIDENCE COUNSELORS MIGHT EMPHASIZE FINANCIAL AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN THE RURAL COMMUNITY.

4. COMMUNITY PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS, FOR EXAMPLE -- REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS, SHOULD INVOLVE YOUTH OF 17-19 YEARS OF AGE TO ASSIST WITH COMMUNITY PLANNING FUNCTIONS BECAUSE THE DECISION TO MIGRATE IS MADE PRIOR TO POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION.

5. RURAL COMMUNITIES SHOULD DEVELOP PROGRAMS TO ASSIST RETURNING RETIREES TO BECOME INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNITY.

6. ADDITIONAL RESEARCH SHOULD BE CONDUCTED IN AREAS SUCH AS:

   A. DETERMINING MORE SPECIFIC FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH FINANCIAL AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES THAT ATTRACTED MIGRANTS FROM RURAL TO URBAN AREAS.

   B. DETERMINING SPECIFIC FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE RURAL COMMUNITY THAT ENCOURAGED RURAL BROTHERS TO REMAIN IN THE RURAL AREA.

   C. COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP POSITIONS OF RURAL MIGRANTS TO URBAN AREAS COMPARED TO THOSE WHO REMAINED IN THE RURAL AREA.

Ag-007 Fol

D. A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF BROTHERS IN THIS SAMPLE FIVE TO TEN YEARS FROM NOW TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF MIGRATION OR RETURN MIGRATION.

E. SIMILAR RESEARCH OUTSIDE OF OHIO TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT SIMILAR RESULTS ARE OBTAINED.

F. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF PARENT-CHILD INTERACTION AND SIBLING INTERACTION; FOR EXAMPLE, ARE VISITS FOR SOCIAL CONTACT ONLY OR A HELPING-SHARING RELATIONSHIP?

REFERENCES

KLINE, LINUS W. "THE MIGRATORY IMPULSE VS. LOVE OF HOME," AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY, X (OCTOBER, 1898).

MITCHELL, JOHN B. AND THOMAS, DONALD W. "NET MIGRATION IN OHIO BY COUNTIES FOR TWO DECADES, 1950-1970," ECONOMIC INFORMATION FOR OHIO AGRICULTURE. COLUMBUS, OHIO: OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, (SEPTEMBER, 1972).

RICO-VELASCO, JESUS ANTONIO. "IMMIGRANTS FROM THE APPALACHIAN REGION TO THE CITY OF COLUMBUS, OHIO: A CASE STUDY." UNPUBLISHED MASTER'S THESIS, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, 1969.

WARNER, W. LLOYD, MEEKER, MARCHIA AND EELLS, KENNETH. SOCIAL CLASS IN AMERICA. NEW YORK: HARPER AND BROTHERS, 1960.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH SERIES

THE APPALACHIAN REGION OF OHIO HAS EXPERIENCED A NET POPULATION OUT-MIGRATION DURING THE PAST FEW DECADES. THE RECENT EMPHASIS ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND EFFORTS TO CREATE ECONOMIC GROWTH IN RURAL AREAS PROVIDED A BASIS FOR THIS EXPLORATION OF FACTS INFLUENCING FAMILY MIGRATION.

THIS SUMMARY IS BASED ON A DOCTORAL DISSERTATION COMPLETED BY ROBERT H. GROVES UNDER THE DIRECTION OF ROBERT W. MCCORMICK. DR. GROVES IS AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, AND DR. MCCORMICK IS AN ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY.

SPECIAL APPRECIATION IS DUE WARREN NOLAND, ASSOCIATE DEAN, CONTINUING EDUCATION, NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY, LAS CRUCES; AND WILLIAM L. HULL, PROFESSOR, AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AND SPECIALIST, THE CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY FOR THEIR CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT PRIOR TO ITS PUBLICATION.

RESEARCH HAS BEEN AN IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION SINCE IT WAS ESTABLISHED IN 1917. RESEARCH CONDUCTED BY THE DEPARTMENT HAS GENERALLY BEEN IN THE FORM OF GRADUATE THESIS, STAFF STUDIES AND FUNDED RESEARCH. IT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SERIES TO MAKE USEFUL KNOWLEDGE FROM SUCH RESEARCH AVAILABLE TO PRACTITIONERS IN THE PROFESSION. INDIVIDUALS DESIRING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THIS TOPIC SHOULD EXAMINE THE REFERENCES CITED IN THE BIBLIOGRAPHY.

J. DAVID MCCRACKEN
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

1976